

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EL AMIN MUHAMMAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRIS KING, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-1306

Hon. Hala Y. Jarbou

ORDER

On December 9, 2024, the magistrate judge entered a report and recommendation (“R&R”) that the Court deny Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction. (R&R, ECF No. 23.) Before the Court are Plaintiff’s objections to the R&R. (Pl.’s Objs., ECF No. 25.)

Under Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,

The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

In his motion for injunctive relief, Plaintiff asks the Court to issue a lien and “performance bond” on Defendants’ assets and to appoint an adjudicator to evaluate their assets so that they cannot dispose of those assets before these proceedings are finalized. (Pl.’s Pet. for Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 20.) The magistrate judge denied the motion because Plaintiff “presented neither evidence nor argument suggesting that he is entitled to the requested relief.” (R&R 2.)

In his objections, Plaintiff recites the factors for a preliminary injunction and concludes that he is entitled to relief. He fails to identify any error in the R&R. Similarly, he fails to identify evidence necessary to demonstrate that he is entitled to preliminary injunctive relief. And as the

magistrate judge observed, he fails to present any argument to support his request. In particular, he does not argue a basis for his unusual request for imposing liens on Defendants' assets. The purpose of a preliminary injunction is to prevent irreparable harm to Plaintiff while the Court resolves his legal claims. Prohibiting Defendants from disposing of their assets or imposing liens on those assets would not serve that purpose.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's objections to the R&R (ECF No. 25) are **OVERRULED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the R&R (ECF No. 23) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF No. 20) is **DENIED**.

Dated: January 10, 2025

/s/ Hala Y. Jarbou
HALA Y. JARBOU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE